REMARKS

In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 11, 21 and 22, and cancel claims 3, 13 and 24. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-23 and 25-31 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 are independent. No new matter has been added.

I.   Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to as being of insufficient quality to permit examination (Office Action, paragraph 3). In the amendments to the drawings, Applicants submit replacement sheets including formal Figures 1-14. No new matter has been added and no issues raised. In light of the amendments to the drawings, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

II.   Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,104,393 to Santos-Gomez (hereafter "Santos-Gomez").

Claims 9, 19 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez in view of United States Patent Number 6,128,622 to Bach et al (hereafter "Bach").

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Santos-Gomez (Office Action, paragraph 5). Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-29 and 31 as set forth below.

The Santos-Gomez reference discusses integrating procedural user interfaces and object-oriented user interfaces (Santos-Gomez, abstract). The prompting approach of wizards is used during creation and modification of objects and their components (Santos-Gomez, abstract). A graphical canvas depicting these components is built incrementally during the object creation

process (Santos-Gomez, abstract). The same graphical canvas is used during modification for direct selection and manipulation of components to be changed (Santos-Gomez, abstract).

A.   Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose at least the following features of amended independent claim 1: "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item,*" and that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

The Examiner alleges at paragraph 5 of the Office Action:

> "As per claim 1, Santos-Gomez discloses *a system for assisting a user in navigating through a performance of a task, the task including a plurality of sub-tasks* (Abstract), the system comprising:
>
> - *a sub-task performance component to control the serial presentation of two or more of the sub-tasks on a graphical user interface, each of the two or more sub-tasks displayed in a respective panel of the graphical user interface* (column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 13), *and to enable the user, for each of the two or more sub-tasks, to perform the sub-task by entering information into the respective panel of the sub-task as the sub-task is being presented* (column 6, lines 4-18)
>
> - *a sub-tasks list component to control the display of a sub-tasks list of items to the user on a graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including displaying, within at least one of the items, information corresponding to the sub-task represented by the at least one item (column 5, lines 27-50).*"

Applicants disagree with the above allegations regarding independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item,*" as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner points to column 5, lines 27-50 of Santos-Gomez as disclosing this feature of claim 1. It appears that the Examiner is pointing to the target object area 100 in Santos-Gomez as disclosing the sub-task list component as recited in claim 1. The cited section of Santos-Gomez discusses the layout of the display screen as illustrated in Figure 3A. Target object area 100 displays the created target objects that are available to the user. For example, Figure 3A shows a list of automation objects as indicated at 101. A grouping relationship may exist among the target objects in target object area 100. Thus, Santos-Gomez teaches that the target object area 100 is merely a *listing of the target objects* available to the user, and does not disclose that the target object area displays *a datum corresponding to a parameter of the target objects.*

In contrast, claim 1 requires "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item.*" Applicants' specification discusses at page 11, lines 5-19 that in existing wizards, as the user is presented a current sub-task, information corresponding to other sub-tasks (beyond the mere identification of the sub-tasks) is not visually indicated to the user. Thus, the user must perform additional steps to learn information corresponding to the other sub-tasks. The aforementioned feature of claim 1 provides an additional functionality over existing wizards: as two or more sub-tasks are being presented to the user, the user can view a datum corresponding to a parameter of a sub-task represented by at least one item in the sub-task list of items.

Santos-Gomez does not disclose such a functionality. For example, Santos-Gomez does not disclose that the target-object area in Figure 3A displays, within at least one of the displayed items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of a target object. Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to the display of such parameter data 207, 215, 214, 216, 218 and 220 in sub-task list 202 in Applicants' Figure 2, and the lack of display of such parameter data in target area 100 in Figure 3A in Santos-Gomez.

The Examiner further alleges at paragraph 5 of the Office Action:

> "As per claim 3, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Santos-Gomez further discloses that the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the information displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks (column 8, lines 35-45)."

Applicants disagree with the above allegations. In the foregoing claim amendments, claim 3 has been incorporated into amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner points to column 8, lines 35-45 of Santos-Gomez as disclosing this feature of claim 3. The cited section of Santos-Gomez discusses that, upon definition of a current target object, the target object area 100 is updated to show the new target object. Thus, Santos-Gomez teaches that the target object area 100 is updated merely to *show a new target object*, and does not disclose that the target object area is updated to *display change of parameter data corresponding to the objects*.

In contrast, claim 1 requires "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks." Applicants' specification discusses at page 11, line 20- page 12, line 7 that in existing wizards, as the user enters information for a current sub-task that changes information corresponding to other sub-tasks, the changed information is not indicated to the

13

user as the user is presented the current sub-task. Some existing wizards present a summary of information at the end of all-tasks, which may result in wasted effort by the user and may require the user to make changes to the information that would otherwise have been unnecessary. The aforementioned feature of claim 1 provides an additional functionality over existing wizards: for each of the at least one item, as the user enters information in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks, the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task is displayed within the item.

Santos-Gomez does not disclose such a functionality. For example, Santos-Gomez does not disclose that the target-object area in Figure 3A displays, within at least one of the displayed items, a change in the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task corresponding to any task. Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to the display of parameter data 207, 215, 214, 216, 218 and 220 in sub-task list 202 in Applicants' Figure 2, and the lack of display of parameter data in target area 100 in Figure 3A in Santos-Gomez.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1.

C.   Claims 2, 4-8 and 10

Claims 2, 4-8 and 10 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly claims 2, 4-8 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 4-8 and 10.

D.   Claim 11

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose at least the following features of independent claim 11: "act (C) includes, for at least one of the items, displaying a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Santos-Gomez fails to disclose "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item*," and that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," and therefore Santos-Gomez does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 11.

E.   Claims 12, 14-18 and 20

Claims 12, 14-18 and 20 depend from independent claim 11 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 11. Accordingly claims 12, 14-18 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 12, 14-18 and 20.

F.   Claim 21

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose at least the following features of independent claim 21: "means for displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and "means for changing, for each of the at least one item, the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Santos-Gomez fails to disclose "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum*

corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," and therefore Santos-Gomez does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 21.

G.   Claim 22

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose at least the following features of independent claim 22: "act (C) includes displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Santos-Gomez fails to disclose "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item,*" and that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," and therefore Santos-Gomez does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 22.

H.   Claims 23, 25-29 and 31

Claims 23, 25-29 and 31 depend from independent claim 22 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 22. Accordingly claims 23, 25-29 and 31 are allowable for at least the

reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 23, 25-29 and 31.

IV.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 19 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez in view of Bach (Office Action, paragraph 7). Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 9, 19 and 30 as set forth below.

A combination of Santos-Gomez and Bach does not teach or suggest the features of claims 9, 19 and 30. As discussed previously in connection with claim 1, Santos-Gomez fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11 and 22 from which claims 9, 19 and 30 depend, respectively. The teachings of Bach do not supplement Santos-Gomez in such a way as to cure the shortcomings of Santos-Gomez with respect to the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 22.

The Bach reference discusses generating program specifications for a computer program that accesses datastore persistent objects materialized from a datastore (Bach, abstract). A wizard or task guide is displayed on a monitor attached to a computer, wherein the wizard includes a step-by-step procedure for creating the program specifications (Bach, abstract). Operator input is accepted into the computer in response to the step-by-step procedure and the program specifications are created using the operator input (Bach, abstract).

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following feature of claim 9: "a sub-task list component to: control the display of a sub-task list of items to the user on the graphical user interface while the two or more sub-tasks are being presented, each item representing a respective one of the plurality of sub-tasks and including a sub-task identifier identifying the respective one of the sub-tasks, including *displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item*," and that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

17

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following feature of claim 19: "act (C) includes, for at least one of the items, displaying a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following feature of claim 30: "act (C) includes displaying, within at least one of the items, a datum corresponding to a parameter of the sub-task represented by the at least one item," and "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the use in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

The Examiner does not cite Bach as teaching or suggesting these features of claims 9, 19 and 30.

For at least the reasons presented above, Santos-Gomez and Bach, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 9, 19 and 30. Therefore, the combination of Santos-Gomez and Bach does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 9, 19 and 30.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. ENB-006. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: June 25, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By _David R. Burns_
David R. Burns
Registration No.: 46,590
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

Attachments

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include amended Figures 1-14 and replace the informal drawings filed with the instant application. No new matter has been added and no issues raised.

Attachment: Replacement sheets